CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1945.

No. 644....

WILLIAMS-BAUER CORPORATION and
CONTI-WILLIAMS CORPORATION,
Petitioners,

vs.

GIOROLOMO DEPASQUALE, JOSEPH CIMINNA
and WILLIAM MORTON,
Respondents.

Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and Brief in Support of Petition.

EMANUEL TACKER,
Counsel for Petitioners.

LOEBER APPEAL PRESS, INC., 65-67 Duane St., N. Y. C., Tel. WOrth-2-0689

INDEX.

PAGE

Petition for Writ of Certiorari:

Summary Statement of Matter Involved 1
Jurisdictional Statement 7
Questions Presented 7
Reasons Relied on for Allowance of Writ 8

Brief in Support of Petition for Writ:

Opinions of Courts Below 12
Jurisdiction 12
Statement of Case 14
Specification of Errors 14

Argument:

Summary of Argument 15

POINT I.—The decisions of the Circuit Court of Appeals and the District Court disclose plain errors of law 15

POINT II.—The Circuit Court of Appeals has decided important and substantial questions of federal law which have not been but should be settled by the Supreme Court 17

POINT III.—The decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals is in conflict with a decision of the Fifth Circuit which held to be reviewable the quality and sufficiency of evidence in cases brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act when an employee testifies to overall averages in computing his hours of work 18

CITATIONS.

PAGE

Cases:

Alaska Steamship Co. v. U. S., 290 U. S. 256 ..... 10, 13
Anderson v. Clemens Pottery Co., writ of certiorari granted October 15, 1945 ..... 9, 13, 17

Brooklyn Savings Bk. v. O'Neill, 65 S. C. 895 .. 13, 16, 17
Brown v. Carter Drilling Co., 38 Fed. Supp. 489, affirmed 116 F. 2nd 27 18
Buchanan v. Higginbotham, 123 Va. 662 16

Continental Collieries v. Shober, 130 F. 2d 631 16

Dameron v. Harris, 281 Mo. 247 16
Daniels v. Wilber, 60 Ill. 526 16

First Nat'l Bk. v. Peck, 180 Ind. 649 16
Florence Oil & Ref'g Co. v. Farrar, 109 Fed. 254 .. 17

Griffith v. Rosenberg, 166 Wash. 677 16

Jax Beer Co. v. Redfern, 124 F. 2d 172 ..... 9, 18

Kretni Dev. Co. v. Consolidated Oil Corp., 74 F. 2d 497 (C. C. A. 10) cert. den. 295 U. S. 759 16

Lowrimore v. Union Bag & Paper Co., 30 Fed. Rep. 647 18

Manzely v. Hooven Letters, 44 N. Y. Supp. 2d 398 18
McInerney v. Virginia-Carolina Chemical Co., 118 Fed. 653 17

Nat'l Millwork Corp. v. Preferred Mutual Fire Ins. Co., 28 F. Supp. 952 17

Reynolds v. U. S., 292 U. S. 443 ..... 10, 13
Rodkinson v. Haecker, 248 N. Y. 480 ..... 15, 16

Schulte (D. S.) Inc. v. Gangi, certiorari granted November 19, 1945 ..... 9, 10, 13, 16, 17

PAGE

Sierocinski v. DuPont, 103 F. 2d 843 16
Southern Railroad Co. v. Walton, 284 U. S. 190 ... 10, 13
Southland Gasoline Co. v. Bayley, 319 U. S. 44 .. 13
Sovereign Bk. of Canada v. Stabley, 176 Fed. 743.. 17
Standard Oil Co. v. Von Etten, 107 U. S. 325 16
Stenton v. Jerome, 54 N. Y. 480 ..... 15, 16

U. S. Navigation Co. v. Cunard, 284 U. S. 474 13

Statutes:

Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 29 USCA 9, 18
Act of February 13, 1925 (C. 229; 43 Stat. 936), amending Judicial Code, Sec. 240 (a) Title 28 USCA Sec. 347(a) 12

Miscellaneous:

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 8 16
Rules of Supreme Court, Rule 38 12



IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1945.

WILLIAMS-BAUER CORPORATION and CONTI-WILLIAMS CORPORATION, *Petitioners,* vs. GIOROLOMO DEPASQUALE, JOSEPH CIMINNA and WILLIAM MORTON, *Respondents.*	No.....

Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and Brief in Support of Petition.

To the Honorable Harlan F. Stone, Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Your petitioners respectfully show:

Summary Statement of Matter Involved.

In the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, a money judgment was recovered on January 26, 1945 (R. 469), following a trial by jury, against the two petitioners as employers, by the three respondents as employees, pursuant to the provisions of Section 16(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938

(29 U. S. C. A. Section 201 *et seq.*) for unpaid overtime compensation, liquidated damages and attorney's fees.

In the answer, the petitioners admitted that they were engaged in production for commerce and that the activities of the three employees were necessary for such production, admitted also that the employees worked overtime hours at various times, but asserted they were paid for all hours worked by them, in full, both at straight time and overtime.

In addition, the answer (R. 15) set up certain affirmative defenses, which, on motion before trial, were struck as insufficient in law on their face, and an intermediate order entered so striking them from the petitioners' answer (R. 24).

The second affirmative defense, so struck, was as follows:

Second Defense—Account Stated—based on allegations that it was the custom and usage, during respondents' periods of employment, for each employee to receive, each week on payday, a statement of the amount due for wages, wages due for straight time and wages due for overtime, as also the total amount due, and the number of hours worked, during the week he was being paid for; that in fact each respondent as such employee was given such a statement each week, that the statement was always accepted by plaintiff, and no complaint or objection made "with respect either to the amount of wages found due to him or the number of hours shown as worked by him during the preceding workweek"—until the action was commenced, "long after a reasonable period of time had elapsed"; that there was an account stated each week, and each respondent as such employee was always "fully paid all sums found due on said accounts stated".

The seventh defense (by Williams-Bauer Corporation against Morton only), was as follows:

Seventh Defense—Accord and Satisfaction—that before suit, under a settlement agreement, Williams-Bauer Corporation paid Morton $45 which he accepted and received "in full satisfaction and discharge" of his claim, and that "at the time of such payment, and accord and satisfaction, as aforesaid, defendant in good faith disputed and denied its liability to said plaintiff with respect to the matters alleged in the complaint".

The petitioners do not here stand on the other affirmative defenses set up in the answer.

At the time of filing their appeal from the judgment in the District Court, the petitioners appealed from the intermediate order dismissing the affirmative defenses set up in the answer. The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has affirmed the judgment in favor of the respondents against the petitioners. Said judgment of affirmance was entered November 2, 1945.

Petitioner prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of affirmance of said Circuit Court.

Petitioners were engaged in salvaging materials from rubbish dumped by New York City trucks at the city's incinerators. The rubbish was dumped into a pit, from which it was conveyed upon a moving conveyor belt, passing the workers who picked the salvaged materials as the belt moved past them; most of this was paper, and the paper and other materials were later baled and prepared for shipment.

DePasquale, one of the respondents, picked off the moving belt, but sometimes he worked at baling or loading (R. 62, 63, 65, 66). Morton was a pressman, baling paper and other materials, and sometimes he loaded (R. 119, 147). Ciminna worked picking off the moving belt exclusively (R. 161).

In the presentation of the respondents' case, no attempt was made to rely upon any records whatever in order

to compute the number of overtime hours respondents claimed they worked each week over a period of over four years; but, instead resort was had to testimony by each plaintiff that he came in to work at a certain time in the morning, and that on some of the days in the week he worked until a certain time, giving approximations, and on other days at certain other times, giving approximations (R. 45, 47, 50, 51, 85, 86, 120, 121, 122, 139, 149, 153, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167). From these approximations, it was contended that DePasquale worked at least 72 or 73 hours each and every week of his employment (R. 54, 56), that Morton worked at least 63, 65 hours during each and every week of his employment (R. 124, 125, 127, 128), that Ciminna worked at least 54, 55 hours during each and every week of his employment (R. 157, 211, 216).

Cross-examination (a) developed a most remarkable series of sworn contradictions on the part of each of the three respondents, not only as to the starting time and quitting time of himself, but also of his two co-plaintiffs, demonstrating not a regular work-schedule of hours, but an irregular work-schedule of hours (R. 120, cf. 139, 74, 167—147 cf. 50, 114—121 cf. 149, 50, 51, 85, 86, 70, 71—151 cf. 76, 77, 78—153, 154 cf. 170—47 cf. 50, 51, 86—73 cf. 74), (b) resulted in a demolition of Morton's claim that he worked at least 63 hours during each and every week of his employment, (c) demonstrated a wholly irreconciliable repugnance between the claims of DePasquale and Ciminna and (d) elicited diametrically opposite statements of the lunch hour time periods.

Morton testified that he did on various occasions keep track of his workhours, that he compared his own record with the timekeeper's and found he was one dollar and change short—sometimes even less, so small an amount that he did not bother to complain (R. 132, 261). But on the trial Morton claimed, and received at the hands of

the jury, as unpaid overtime compensation (before the addition of liquidated damages) $12, $13, $14 and as high as $19.79 as weekly shortages, according to a schedule which was prepared and offered in evidence (Testimony of George M. Aronwald, pp. 285-303). Morton admitted on cross-examination, with respect to two specific weeks the dates of which were determinable, that he worked only 42 hours during such weeks and not 63 hours which he had claimed, and for which he actually recovered from the jury (R. 132-138, 261).

Ciminna's duties, admittedly, were confined to working at the moving belt (R. 160, 161); the belt did not start moving until 8:15 A. M. when the trucks started coming in (R. 75, 317); to make up the additional hours, in order to support the claim of a 54 hour workweek minimum, Ciminna testified that he commenced work at 7:30 A. M., and that between that time and 8:00 A. M. he did the cleaning under the belt (R. 161); but DePasquale had testified, when explaining why he worked after 4:30 P. M. when the belt stopped, in order to show the balance of the 72 hours minimum he claimed to have worked each week, that it was his job, working with several other men, to work each afternoon at the time when the belt stopped, cleaning under the belt, so that when they got through with their work "it was clean" and that the purpose was "so that in the morning everybody could go right to work" (R. 68, 76).

The length of the lunch period was a factor in the computation of the worktime of the men. DePasquale and Morton, working side by side each day for a period of over four years, gave the following diametrically opposed accounts of the lunch period: DePasquale claimed that each and every week, the employees had one hour for lunch on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays but that on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays he and three others had only 20 to 30 minutes for lunch (R. 45, 50, 115);

Morton's story was quite the opposite, saying that it was on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays the men had a one hour lunch period and that it was on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays the men (all of them, not merely four) had a 20 to 30 minutes lunch period (R. 121, 147, 148).

With respect to the special defenses, stricken out on motion, the District Court held (R. 467) with regard to the defense of account stated that "Nothing that the employer or employee may do contrary to its terms can be availed of to prevent the enforcement of the Act"—in effect, a holding that the defense cuts down the wages that an employee may recover, although there is nothing in this defense which does that; and, with regard to the defense of accord and satisfaction, stated merely that it was dismissed "for the same reason stated with respect to the second defense".

In its opinion, passing on the sufficiency of these defenses, the Circuit Court stated that the defense of account stated was insufficient; it being the law that "an express agreement to work for less than the statutory rate is invalid * * * surely an account stated can stand no higher"—although the defense does not deprive the employee of anything, but searches the evidence for the truth and goes to the heart of the question as to what the employee is really entitled to; and with regard to the defense of accord and satisfaction, the Circuit Court said the defense did not fall "within the caveat which we threw out in *Gangi* v. *D. S. Schulte Inc.* * * * neither defendant pleads adequate facts to show the applicability of this suggestion"—although in the *Gangi* case the Circuit Court was passing on the facts adduced during a trial testing the sufficiency of evidence, while here it was a ruling on a pleading only that was involved, testing only the sufficiency of a pleading.

As to the appeal taken from the judgment, the Circuit Court dismissed petitioners' contention that the respondents had not made out a case, because there was not substantial "truthful" evidence to support a verdict and that the testimony of the three plaintiffs was not worthy of credence so that the motion of dismissal should have been granted—saying, that it was being asked to usurp the functions of the jury; the Court failed to make any comment on the cases urged by petitioners in support of their contention.

Jurisdictional Statement.

It is submitted that the United States Supreme Court has power and jurisdiction to review the judgment here in question under the Act of February 13, 1925 (C. 229; 43 Stat. 936) amending the Judicial Code, Section 240 (a) Title 28 U. S. C. A. Section 347 (a); and under Rule 38, Subdivision (5) of the Rules of the Supreme Court.

Questions Presented.

The questions to be resolved by the Supreme Court are as follows:

1. Whether the affirmative defense of account stated is applicable to transactions between employer and employee where, in litigation between them, the sole question in issue is how many hours did the employee actually work, and the employer does not put in issue any question of law regarding the applicability of the Fair Labor Standards Act, pursuant to which the action is brought.

2. Whether, in such a case, an employer may plead accord and satisfaction, upon alleging that there was an honest dispute at the time of the accord with regard to the matters referred to in the complaint.

3. Whether, in such a case, and assuming such a defense may be pleaded, is it sufficient to plead the ultimate facts, or must the evidentiary facts be pleaded.

4. Whether, in such a suit, where plaintiffs do not rely upon records in order to furnish the basis for correct computations, but testify to their working time in general terms, and it appears, considering only the direct and cross-examinations of the plaintiffs themselves, that the workhours were highly irregular, that the number of hours worked each week is not clear, and that the nature of the testimony is such as to demonstrate the falsity of the plaintiffs' claims, is there substantial evidence of a satisfactory sort which may be made the basis for a verdict at the hands of a jury, and must such a case go to the jury, regardless of the serious weaknesses developed regarding such claims.

Reasons Relied on for Allowance of Writ.

A. In holding that an account stated may not be pleaded as a defense in an action brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Circuit Court for the Second Circuit has decided that a common-law defense may not be pleaded; this case appears to be the first which presents this question for decision by the Supreme Court; the Circuit Court has thus decided an important and substantial question of Federal law which has not been and should be settled by the Supreme Court.

B. In holding that the defense of account stated is not applicable, the Circuit Court for the Second Circuit has decided an important question of general law which, it is respectfully submitted, is probably untenable, and, because the applicability of the law is not put in issue, is in conflict with the weight of authority.

C. In holding that the defense of accord and satisfaction is not sufficient in law, the Circuit Court for the Second Circuit has decided an important question of Federal law which has not been, and should be decided by this Court, where in the pleading it is alleged that the accord was arrived at following an honest dispute as to the employee's work and pay, and in holding that this defense is not sufficient because evidentiary facts are not pleaded, the Circuit Court has decided an important question of general law in a way which is probably untenable. This Court has granted certiorari to test the sufficiency of this type of defense, where a *bona fide* dispute is alleged (*D. S. Schulte Inc.* v. *Gangi*, No. 517, writ granted November 19, 1945), and a similar question is presented here, except that here it is the construction of a pleading that is involved instead of sufficiency of proof.

D. In deciding that it would not examine into the question of whether there was satisfactory substantial evidence upon which a judgment can be based, where the proof of workhours is general and approximate, rather than specific, and the workhours schedule irregular rather than regular, the Circuit Court for the Second Circuit has rendered a decision which is in conflict with a decision of another Circuit Court of Appeals on the same matter (*Jax Beer Co.* v. *Redfern*, 124 F. 2d 172 [CCA 5]).

1. It is fundamental that the Supreme Court will exercise its appellate jurisdiction where important questions of general law involving novel issues are decided by the lower courts, and this has been especially true in cases brought under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act (recent examples are the cases of *D. S. Schulte Inc.* v. *Gangi*, No. 517, writ granted November 19, 1945; *Anderson* v. *Clemens Pottery Co.*, No. 342, writ granted October 15, 1945).

2. The decisions of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the District Court for the Southern District of New York disclose plain errors of law and certiorari should be granted to correct these errors (*Reynolds* v. *U. S.*, 292 U. S. 443, 54 S. Ct. 800; *Southern Railroad Co.* v. *Walton*, 284 U. S. 190, 52 S. Ct. 58; *Alaska Steamship Co.* v. *U. S.*, 290 U. S. 256, 54 S. Ct. 159).

The ruling of the District Court in striking the defense of account stated was erroneous and followed blindly the decisions in which it had been held that general releases are not valid defenses where no issue of fact was involved, but one of law. The practice of presenting employees with a statement of their workhours and wages due for straight time and overtime on paydays is increasing, and it is of importance to employers to know whether they may not avail themselves of this defense if years later, employees see fit to question the wages paid and come into court with a claim based on memory and approximations.

The defense of account stated, differently from the defense of release, does not cut down the amount of wages an employee is entitled to, but on the contrary searches for the truth of the matter and helps the trier of the facts to resolve the fact issues.

The Circuit Court, on this question, has merely followed the line of error taken by the District Court.

With regard to the defense of accord and satisfaction, this Court has already determined to resolve the sufficiency of such a defense where a *bona fide* dispute as to fact is involved (*D. S. Schulte* v. *Gangi*) and a similar question is here involved, relating to a pleading rather than to sufficiency of evidence. The Circuit Court has overlooked this important distinction.

With regard to the refusal of the Circuit Court to pass on the question of whether the evidence adduced by the plaintiffs can validly support a recovery, it is respectfully

submitted that the question involves a large question of judicial policy. In a case of this kind, where computations are the heart of recovery, and the testimony is general in character, the fact that there are many sworn contradictions destroying the accuracy of the general theory of recovery, and the fact that in one case, cross-examination succeeded in demolishing the claim of a plaintiff, while in the cases of the other two plaintiffs, their claims were shown to be mutually so repugnant that both cannot be true, but one must be deemed false, raises a very serious question as to whether there is substantial evidence to support a recovery, and whether the evidence can be deemed at all satisfactory.

Wherefore your petitioner prays that a writ of certiorari issue under the seal of this court, directed to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, commanding said court to certify and send to this Court a full and complete transcript of the record and of the proceedings of the said Circuit Court had in the case entitled on its docket *Giorolomo DePasquale, Joseph Ciminna and William Morton, Plaintiffs-Appellees* v. *Williams-Bauer Corporation and Conti-Williams Corporation, Defendants-Appellants,* to the end that this cause may be reviewed and determined by this Court as provided for by the Statutes of the United States; and that the judgment herein of said Circuit Court be reversed by this Court, and for such further relief as to this Court may seem proper.

Dated, December ..7..., 1945.

EMANUEL TACKER,
Counsel for Petitioners.

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION.

Opinions of Courts Below.

The opinion of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (R. 473.) was rendered on November 2, 1945. The opinion of the District Court for the Southern District of New York was rendered on September 13, 1943 (R. 467-468). Judgment was entered in the District Court on January 26, 1945 (R. 469-471), and by the said Circuit Court on November 2, 1945 (R. 478.).

Jurisdiction.

1. The date of the judgment to be reviewed is November 2, 1945; the petition for writ of certiorari is being presented prior to February 2, 1946, to wit, on or about December 10, 1945.

2. The statutory provision which is believed to sustain the jurisdiction of this Court is the Act of February 13, 1925 (C. 229; 43 Stat. 938) amending the Judicial Code, Section 240 (a) Title 28 USCA Section 347(a) and Rule 38, subdivision (5) of the Rules of the Supreme Court.

3. The nature of the within case and the rulings of the Circuit Court are such as to bring the case within said jurisdictional provisions.

This case involves:

a. an important question of federal law which has not been and should be settled by the Supreme Court,

b. the decision of an important question of general law which is probably untenable, and, is in conflict with the weight of authority,

c. a decision by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit which is in conflict with a decision by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

4. Cases believed to sustain said jurisdiction are as follows:

Brooklyn Savings Bank v. *O'Neill,* 65 Sup. Ct. Rep. 895;
D. S. Schulte Inc. v. *Gangi* (writ granted November 19, 1945);
Anderson v. *Clemens Pottery Co.* (writ granted October 15, 1945);
Reynolds v. *U. S.,* 292 U. S. 443;
Southern Railroad Co. v. *Walton,* 284 U. S. 190;
Alaska Steamship Co. v. *U. S.,* 290 U. S. 256;
U. S. Navigation Co. v. *Cunard Steamship Co.,* 284 U. S. 474;
Southland Gasoline Co. v. *Bayley,* 319 U. S. 44.

5. The questions involved are substantial. Very many employers who give their employees statements as to the number of hours which their books show they work, and the amount of wages due the employees, are interested in knowing the legal effect of the retention of such statements and failure to claim shortages for unreasonable periods of time, and are directly affected by the decision in this case regarding the validity of the defense of account stated.

Businessmen generally are interested vitally in knowing whether settlements made with employees where an honest dispute is involved are permissible, and their attorneys are vitally interested in knowing how to advise them in such matters, and how to plead such a defense where it is available.

There are many lawsuits being brought pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, where employees rely

upon memory evidence, rather than records, in order to make out a case, and it is important to judges and lawyers generally, and to employers, to know whether appellate courts should inquire into the quality of evidence, where cross-examination demolishes the main props of a *prima facie* case.

Statement of Case.

A statement of the case has already been made in the petition under the title "Summary Statement of Matter Involved" (pp. 1-7) which is hereby adopted and made a part of this brief.

Specification of Errors.

The Circuit Court erred in holding that:

(1) the defense of account stated is invalid and may not be pleaded in an action brought pursuant to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938

(2) the defense of accord and satisfaction is invalid and may not be pleaded where it is alleged in the defense that at the time of the accord there was an honest dispute as to the facts stated in the complaint

(3) that a defense must state more than ultimate facts relied on

(4) that an appellate court will not inquire into whether a plaintiff's case contains satisfactory substantial evidence to support a recovery.

ARGUMENT.

Summary of Argument.

POINT I.

The decisions of the Circuit Court of Appeals and the District Court disclose plain errors of law.

POINT II.

The Circuit Court of Appeals has decided important and substantial questions of federal law which have not been but should be settled by the Supreme Court.

POINT III.

The decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals is in conflict with a decision of the Fifth Circuit which held to be reviewable the quality and sufficiency of evidence in cases brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 where an employee testified to overall averages in computing his hours of work.

POINT I.

The decisions of the Circuit Court of Appeals and the District Court disclose plain errors of law.

It has been held that the principle of account stated is not confined to transactions between merchants, but that it has been extended to embrace transactions between other persons (*Rodkinson* v. *Haecker,* 248 N. Y. 480, *Stenton* v. *Jerome,* 54 N. Y. 480; that where an account is made up and rendered, he who receives it is bound to examine it or have someone else examine it for him; that he may either expressly admit its correctness or that such correctness may be implied if he keeps it for an unreasonable length of time and his silence construed as acquiescence in its justness (*Rodkinson* v. *Haecker,* 248 N. Y. 480).

In holding that the defense may not be pleaded at all in the instant case, the Circuit Court, as the District Court theretofore, has made a decision clearly against the weight of authority.

Rodkinson v. *Haecker,* 248 N. Y. 480;
Stenton v. *Jerome,* 54 N. Y. 480;
Griffith v. *Rosenberg,* 166 Wash. 677;
Standard Oil Co. v. *Von Etten,* 107 U. S. 325;
Dameron v. *Harris,* 281 Mo. 247;
Buchanan v. *Higginbotham,* 123 Va. 662;
Daniels v. *Wilber,* 60 Ill. 526;
First Nat'l Bk. v. *Peck,* 180 Ind. 649;
Kretni Dev. Co. v. *Consolidated Oil Corp.,* 74 F. (2d) 497 (C. C. A. 10) cert. den. 295 U. S. 759;

Again, in holding that the defense of accord and satisfaction is insufficient in law, where the defense pleads that at the time of the accord there was an honest dispute in good faith, the Court has made a decision probably untenable; although in the case of *Brooklyn Savings Bank* v. *O'Neill* (65 S. C. 895) this Court has held that a release may not be pleaded, where it clearly appeared from the record that the defense had the effect of cutting down what was concededly due an employee, that is not the case here; and the question whether such a defense is good, in a case brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act, has been expressly held open by this Court (*D. S. Schulte* v. *Gangi,* certiorari granted November 19, 1945).

The ruling of the Circuit Court, in the instant case, that the defense failed to plead sufficient facts is probably untenable, for it is provided in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that each averment in a pleading shall be simple, concise and direct (Rule 8[e][1], *Continental Collieries* v. *Shober,* 130 F. 2d 631, *National Millwork Corp.* v. *Preferred Mutual Fire Ins. Co.,* 28 F. Supp. 952, *Sierocinski* v. *Dupont,* 103 F. 2d 843), and the same rule

is applicable to special defenses (Rule 8[b], *National Millwork Corp.* v. *Preferred Mutual Fire Ins. Co.*, 28 F. Supp. 952) while only the ultimate facts need be stated, and not matters of evidence (*McInerney* v. *Virginia-Carolina Chemical Co.*, 118 Fed. 653, *Florence Oil & Refining Co.* v. *Farrar*, 109 Fed. 254, *Sovereign Bk. of Canada* v. *Stanley*, 176 Fed. 743).

POINT II.

The Circuit Court of Appeals has decided important and substantial questions of federal law which have not been but should be settled by the Supreme Court.

This case appears to be the first which presents for decision the question whether an employer may plead an account stated as to the number of hours worked during a workweek, and the amount of wages due for the week; it has heretofore been held that questions involving the interposition of affirmative defenses in suits brought pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act present substantial questions of federal law (*Brooklyn Savings Bank* v. *O'Neill*, 65 S. C. 895; *D. S. Schulte* v. *Gangi*, certiorari granted November 19, 1945; *Anderson* v. *Clemens Pottery Co.*, certiorari granted October 15, 1945, to name a few); it is respectfully submitted that this case is in the same category.

Also, with regard to the defense of accord and satisfaction, the Court is presented with the same question which is presented to it for consideration and resolution in the case of *D. S. Schulte* v. *Gangi*, with the single distinction that whereas in that case, what is involved is the consideration of the sufficiency of evidence, what is involved here is the consideration of the sufficiency of the pleading, rather than the evidence itself.

The questions presented by these two defenses are therefore new, important and substantial questions of federal law which have not been but should be settled by the Supreme Court.

POINT III.

The decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals is in conflict with a decision of the Fifth Circuit which held to be reviewable the quality and sufficiency of evidence in cases brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 where an employee testified to overall averages in computing his hours of work.

The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit has ruled that where evidence as to the material facts in a case brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act is uncertain and conjectural, so that the decision must be based on speculation and "averages made up from the uncertain recollections of" employees, there is "nothing substantial upon which to predicate a verdict" (*Jax Beer Co.* v. *Redfern*, 124 F. 2d 172). And this case has been followed elsewhere (*Lowrimore* v. *Union Bag & Paper Co.*, 30 Fed. Supp. 647; *Brown* v. *Carter Drilling Co.*, 38 Fed. Supp. 489, affirmed 116 F. 2d 27; *Manzely* v. *Hooven Letters*, 44 N. Y. Supp. 2d 398—N. Y. City Court).

Cross-examination of the three plaintiffs in the instant case pointed to an analogous situation—but the Circuit Court in the instant case refused to pay attention to the analogous facts presented, and refused to pass on the quality of the evidence, which pointed to irregularity, not regularity of hours, and was based on overall averages; this decision is in conflict with the *Jax Beer Co.* v. *Redfern* case, which holds the quality of the evidence is reviewable, to determine whether the recovery was indeed based on speculation and conjecture.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that, on the basis of the foregoing, this Court should exercise its review powers by granting a writ of certiorari, in order to consider and resolve the questions at issue and reverse the decision of the Circuit Court, if upon such review, the law and justice requires.

EMANUEL TACKER,
Counsel for Petitioners.

Office - Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
DEC 24 1945
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1945.

No. 644.

WILLIAMS-BAUER CORPORATION and CONTI-WILLIAMS CORPORATION,
Petitioners,

vs.

GIOROLOMO DEPASQUALE, JOSEPH CIMINNA and WILLIAM MORTON,
Respondents.

Brief for the Respondents in Opposition to Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

GEORGE M. ARONWALD,
Counsel for Respondents,
Office & P. O. Address,
No. 305 Broadway,
Borough of Manhattan,
City of New York.

LODER APPEAL PRESS, INC., 65-67 Duane St., N. Y. C., Tel. WOrth-2-0689

INDEX.

	PAGE
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Questions Presented	2
The Statute Involved	2
Statement	2
Argument	3
POINT I.—The decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals is not in conflict with a decision of the Fifth Circuit. This Court will not review evidence or inferences drawn from it	3
POINT II.—A plea by way of defense of accord and satisfaction will be rejected unless facts are alleged which show that an honest dispute existed between the parties	4
POINT III.—A defense of account stated is invalid and will not defeat the right of an employee to recovery under the Act	5
CONCLUSION	6

CASES CITED.

PAGE

Brooklyn Savings Bank v. O'Neill, 65 S. C. 895 .. 5

General Talking Pictures Corp. v. Western Electric, 304 U. S. 175 4

Jax Beer Co. v. Redfern, 124 Fed. 2d| 172 3

Picket v. Union Terminal Co., 33 Fed. Supp. 244 .. 5

Simmons v. Rudolph Knitty Mills, 37 N. Y. S. (2) 422 5

Wilkinson v. Noland, 40 Fed. Supp. 1009 5

STATUTES CITED.

Judicial Code, Section 240 (a) as amended by Act of February 13, 1925 1

U. S. Code, Act of June 25, 1938, C. 676, 52 Stat. 1060 2

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1945.

WILLIAMS-BAUER CORPORATION and CONTI-WILLIAMS CORPORATION, *Petitioners,* vs. GIOROLOMO DEPASQUALE, JOSEPH CIMINNA and WILLIAM MORTON, *Respondents.*	No. 644.

Brief for the Respondents in Opposition to Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

Opinions Below.

The opinion of the District Court (R. 467-468) is not officially reported. The opinion of the Circuit Court of Appeals (R. 475) is not yet reported.

Jurisdiction.

The judgment of the Circuit Court of Appeals was entered on November 2, 1945. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under Section 240(a) of the Judicial Code, as amended by the Act of February 13, 1925.

Questions Presented.

The primary questions presented are whether the defense of Account Stated may be asserted in an action brought pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and the sufficiency of the plea of Accord and Satisfaction. The petitioner also asks for a review of the fact questions which were presented to the jury in the District Court that were resolved in favor of the respondents.

The Statute Involved.

The original statute, before being incorporated into the United States Code was the Act of June 25, 1938, C. 676, 52 Stat. 1060. The statute is known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and for the purpose of brevity will be hereinafter referred to as the "Act", or the "Statute."

Statement.

This case arose as an action brought by the respondents under the Act. The facts are relatively simple. Respondents, employees of the defendants, claimed unpaid overtime compensation. Each was employed as a salvage worker at an incinerator plant in Brooklyn, N. Y. Petitioner, Williams-Bauer Corp. operated the plant until July, 1942. Thereafter Conti-Williams Corp. became the successor operator. For practical purposes no change in the method of operations was effected thereby.

Respondent, DePasquale worked a minimum of 70 hours per week, but was paid according to petitioner's records for substantially less. Morton worked no less than 63 hours per week, but was paid for substantially less. Cimmna when paid $14.00 per week or more worked a minimum of 53 hours per week. The jury by their verdict believed the plaintiffs.

The petitioners' answer admitted that the respondents were engaged in the production of goods for commerce

and that the activities of the said employees were necessary for such production.

It should be noted that the petitioners failed to keep or produce upon the trial such records as they were required to preserve under Section 11c of the Act.

Argument.

Petitioners urge the following reasons for the granting by this Court of a writ of certiorari:

(1) The Circuit Court erred in holding that the defense of Account Stated is invalid and may not be pleaded.

(2) The Circuit Court erred in holding that the defense of Accord and Satisfaction is invalid where only conclusions of fact were pleaded.

(3) The Circuit Court erred in refusing to review the facts passed upon by the jury.

It is submitted that there is no substance to any of these alleged reasons and in support of our position that the writ should be denied, we submit the following points, varying the sequence of petitioners' points in the interest of clarity.

POINT I.

The decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals is not in conflict with a decision of the Fifth Circuit. This Court will not review evidence or inferences drawn from it.

The holding of the Fifth Circuit is not in point. The case relied on by petitioners is *Jax Beer Co.* v. *Redfern*, 124 Fed. 2d 172. There the plaintiffs did not testify as

to a minimum number of hours of work in each week, but testified to an approximate number. Moreover, plaintiffs were unable to calculate the salary due and received during the disputed period. The opinion points this out as follows:

> "Neither plaintiff was able to testify as to the number of hours worked each day, but each testified 'on an average' they worked from 7 in the morning until 9 o'clock at night. Redfern was unable to testify * * * as to the amount of salary, including commissions, that he received during the disputed period."

This is not the situation presented at bar. The respondents herein testified to a minimum number of hours of work in each week and the petitioners' records were used to indicate the salary paid them in that period.

The ruling of the Court below is not in conflict with any decision of this Court, nor with any decision of any other Circuit Court of Appeals. The granting of a writ of certiorari is not warranted merely to review evidence or inferences drawn from it. *General Talking Pictures Corp.* v. *Western Electric,* 304 U. S. 175.

POINT II.

A plea by way of defense of accord and satisfaction will be rejected unless facts are alleged which show that an honest dispute existed between the parties.

As was pointed out by the Circuit Court the defense failed to plead adequate facts. Conclusions were pleaded without any facts to support them. Although petitioners do not raise the question it is well to note that they

pleaded in addition to the defense of Accord and Satisfaction as a bar to this action, the defense of release (R. 21). It clearly appears therefore that that defense had the effect of reducing the sum of money due the employee. Such a defense was rejected by this Court in *Brooklyn Savings Bank* v. *O'Neill,* 65 S. C. 895 and does not now present a substantial question of federal law to be settled by this Court.

POINT III.

A defense of account stated is invalid and will not defeat the right of an employee to recovery under the Act.

The employers' obligation to pay wages and overtime to its employees is not exclusively the private concern of the parties but is regulated by Statute passed in the public interest. The objectives of the Act and the methods employed to attain them may not be set at naught.

Wilkinson v. *Noland,* 40 Fed. Supp. 1009.

The Act is clear and mandatory. Nothing that the employer or employee may do contrary to its terms can be availed of to prevent the enforcement thereof. It was written in the interest of the employees.

Picket v. *Union Terminal Co.,* 33 Fed. Supp. 244.

The Courts have consistently refused to permit a circumvention thereof by whatever guise the employer might attempt.

Simmons v. *Rudolph Knitty Mills,* 37 N. Y. S. (2) 422.

What is attempted by this defense is a circumvention of the provisions of the Act which the Courts will not tolerate. No novel, new or important question of Federal Law is presented which should be settled by the Supreme Court.

CONCLUSION.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the petition for certiorari is without merit and should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE M. ARONWALD,
Counsel for Respondents.